REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-26 were presented for examination and claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-26 were rejected. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10, 11, 25 and 26, which were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the present amendment, claims 1-4, 7-10, 13, 15, 17 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-26 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 17 and 22 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-26 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner objects to the number of references submitted via Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on June 3, 2008. Applicants submit that the IDS was filed in compliance with rules § 1.56, § 1.97 and § 1.98. Under these rules, Applicants are not required to include an explanation of relevance as requested by the Examiner. Applicants hereby resubmit this IDS in compliance with the rules. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider all the listed references as required by the rules.

4393781v1

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

In the first Office Action dated March 5, 2008, the Examiner objected to the drawings and contended that FIGs. 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art -- because the Examiner contends that only that which is old is illustrated. Applicants traversed this objection in the response dated June 5, 2008. In that response, Applicants disagreed that FIGs. 1 and 2 only illustrate prior art and highlighted, as an example of non-prior-art, the Security Gateway labeled 130 in FIGs. 1 and 2. Applicants made no admission of prior art with respect to these figures.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the objections to the drawings in the final Office Action. However, the Examiner incorrectly stated that there was an admission of prior art with regards to FIGs. 1 and 2. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the purported admission.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because it contains embedded hyperlinks (paragraphs 38, 72, 75 and 80) and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 608.01, which recites:

> "Where the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes themselves rather than the contents of the site to which the hyperlinks are directed are part of applicant's invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks. The Office will disable these hyperlinks when preparing the text to be loaded onto the USPTO web database."

4393781v1

Applicants submit that the cited uniform resource locator (URL) references are used under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, to support the description of the claimed invention in the specification. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the URL references are not intended to be browser executable hyperlinks and are not intended to incorporate any references. Therefore, Applicants request that the USPTO disable these URL references when preparing the text to be loaded onto the USPTO web database. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

I.   Claims 15 and 17-26 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 15 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner contends that the systems of claims 15 and 17-26 comprise only software not embodied in tangible form, and as such, are non-statutory. Applicants traverse this rejection. Independent claims 15, 17 and 22 have been amended. Applicants submit that claims 15, 17 and 22 are directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 18-21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended, and claims 23-26 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 22 as amended. Thus, claims 18-21 and 23-26 are also directed towards statutory subject matter. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

II.   Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 13-15, 17, and 20-22 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 13-15, 17, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0015463 to Herrera et al. ("Herrera"). Applicants

respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 17 and 22 are independent claims.

Claims 4-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1,

claim 14 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13,

and claims 20-21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent

claim 17. Applicants submit that Herrera fails to disclose each and every element recited in

these claims.

A. Claims 1 and 17 Patentably Distinguished over Herrera

Claim 1 is directed to a method and claim 17 is directed to a system. Claims 1 and 17

recite extracting field name-value pairs from messages received via a network and determining a

most restrictive data type of values from a plurality of data types of values for a field name of the

extracted field name-value pairs. Herrera fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed

invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found,

either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Herrera does not disclose

the above feature of the claimed invention. Instead of determining a most restrictive data type of

values from the same field from network messages, the inferencing engine of Herrera applies a

rulebase on a set of input values to generate output values. Herrera does not contemplate a

process of extracting field values from multiple network messages such that a plurality of data

types are identified for a field. Rather, Herrera uses object based rules with conditions to

determine how to generate output from the input. Although these conditions of the rules

determine whether a value of a field is valid, the rules do not determine different data types of

values for the same field across multiple inputs and select the most restrictive of these data types.

Thus, Herrera fails to disclose determining a most restrictive data type of values from a plurality of data types of values for a field name of the extracted field name-value pairs.

Because Herrera fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 7, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 17 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 4 and 5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 20 and 21 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4-5 and 20-21 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4-5, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

B. Claims 7 and 22 Patentably Distinguished over Herrera

Claim 7 is directed to a method and claim 7 is directed to a system. Claims 7 and 22 recite extracting URL components from URL messages received from a network, and determining for URL components at a same level, with a same root URL component, a most restrictive data type from a plurality of data types of extracted URL components at the same level. Herrera fails to disclose this element of the claimed invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Herrera does not disclose the above feature of the claimed invention. Instead of determining a most restrictive data type of extracted URL components at a same level from URL messages, the inferencing engine of Herrera applies a rulebase on a set of input values to generate output values. Herrera does not disclose a process of extracting URL components from multiple URL messages such that a plurality of data types are identified at a URL component level. Rather, the inferencing engine of Herrera receives input values channeled into object fields and applies rules on these values to

determine how to generate outputs. Although the rules determine whether a value of a field is valid, these rules do not contemplate extracting URL components from messages to determine different data types of the URL components at a same level and with a same root URL. Since Herrera does not determine different data types of the URL components as required, Herrera cannot select a most restrictive of these data types. Thus, Herrera fails to disclose extracting URL components from URL messages received from a network and determining for URL components at a same level, with a same root URL component, a most restrictive data type from a plurality of data types of extracted URL components at the same level.

Because Herrera fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 7 and 22, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 22 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

C. Claims 13 and 15 Patentably Distinguished over Herrera

Claim 13 is directed to a method and claim 15 is directed to a system. Claims 13 and 15 recite determining a match factor for each data type of the scalar objects, the match factor indicating a fraction of scalar objects that match the data type. Claims 13 and 15 further recite selecting a most restrictive data type from the plurality of data types of the scalar objects, the most restrictive data type having a match factor exceeding a threshold and having no child data types with a match factor exceeding the threshold. Herrera fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Herrera fails to disclose the above features of the claimed invention. Instead of determining a match factor for each data

type of scalar objects identified from network messages to select a most restrictive data type,

Herrera merely applies a rulebase on a set of input values to generate outputs. Further, Herrera

does not contemplate a process of identifying scalar objects from multiple network messages

such that a plurality of data types are identified for the scalar objects, and therefore does not

determine a match factor for each of the identified data types. The inferencing engine of Herrera

merely determines whether an input value is valid and whether to execute an action. The

inferencing engine does not process scalar objects across multiple network messages to

determine match factors for each data type of the scalar objects. Thus, Herrera fails to disclose

each and every element of the claimed invention.

Because Herrera fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 13 and

15, Applicants submit that claims 13 and 15 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 depends on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13.

Thus, Herrera fails to detract from the patentability of this dependent claim. Accordingly,

Applicants submit that claim 14 is also patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13-15 under

35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

III. Dependent claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19 and 23-24 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Dependent claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as

unpatentable over Herrera, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,089,542 to Brand et al. ("Brand").

Claims 2 and 3 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim

1. Claims 8 and 9 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent

claim 7. Claims 18 and 19 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of

4393781v1

independent claim 17. Claims 23 and 24 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject

matter of independent claim 22. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that

Herrera in view of Brand, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every

element recited in claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19 and 23-24.

 A. <u>Claims Dependent from Patentable Independent Claims 1, 7, 17 and 22</u>

 For the reasons discussed above in connection with the rejection of the independent

claims 1, 7, 17 and 22, Applicants submit independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 22 are patentable and

in condition for allowance. Thus, claims dependent from claims 1, 7, 17 and 22 are patentable

and in condition for allowance. These include claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19 and 23-24. As such,

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19, and 23-24 are patentable and in

condition for allowance.

 In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Herrera does not expressly disclose

generating nor applying a rule using the most restrictive data type of URL components or values

for a field name. The Examiner cites Brand in the Office Action only to suggest one ordinarily

skilled in the art might modify Herrera to generate or apply a rule using the most restrictive data

type of URL components or values for a field name. However, as with Herrera, Brand does not

disclose, teach or suggest generating or applying a rule using the most restrictive data type of

URL components or values for a field name. Brand describes fault analysis in software

programs, and teaches a constraint solver that takes in a set of conditions as input for the analysis,

and determines if the conditions are satisfiable. Brand, however, does not describe a most

restrictive data type determined from the input to the constraint solver. Accordingly, Brand does

not disclose, teach or suggest generating or applying a rule using the most restrictive data type of

URL components or values for a field name. Therefore, Herrera in view of Brand fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Because Herrera in view of Brand, alone or in combination, fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention, Applicants submit dependent claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19, and 23-24 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-3, 8-9, 18-19, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

4393781v1

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: <u>December 3, 2008</u>   *<u>/Christopher J. McKenna/</u>*
                                                 Christopher J. McKenna
                                                 Registration No. 53,302
                                                 Attorney for Applicants

                                                 Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
                                                 Two International Place
                                                 Boston, MA 02110
                                                 (617) 248-5000